

## POLICY RESEARCH WORKING PAPER

WPS2641

2641

# Is Russia Restructuring?

## New Evidence on Job Creation and Destruction

*Harry G. Broadman**Francesca Recanatini*

A dynamic market—one that facilitates the creation of jobs in productive enterprises and the destruction of jobs in unproductive enterprises—is increasingly viewed as essential for countries making the transition from centrally planned to market systems. Russia's privatization initiatives have not adequately reduced the overmanning of firms that was typical under the socialist system and the reallocation of labor has been relatively limited. There has been only a modest decline in state enterprises' hiring rates, labor hoarding has been widespread, and the labor market has taken few and limited steps toward becoming more flexible and competitive.

The World Bank  
Europe and Central Asia Region  
Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Sector Unit  
July 2001



## Summary findings

Broadman and Recanatini explore the labor dynamics of Russian enterprise restructuring, empirically assessing how patterns of job creation and destruction are related to various aspects of enterprise restructuring across firms in different sectors and regions, and to different forms, sizes, vintages, and performance characteristics of ownership.

Evidence from case studies—based on more than 50 site visits in 2000—suggests that jobs have been destroyed, but only to a limited degree in some sectors and regions, largely because of institutional and incentive constraints and a still-widespread “socialist” corporate culture. Jobs have been created—particularly in sectors where devaluation had the most pronounced effect on import substitution and export promotion—but only slowly, mostly for lack of skilled workers and because regional mobility is limited. Labor turnover appears higher *within* regions than *across* regions.

Newly available data for 1996–99 (provided by Goskomstat) for about 128,000 enterprises in 24

industrial sectors in Russia’s 89 regions indicates that the typical firm has experienced only modest downsizing—about 12 percent—in number of employees. Smaller firms have entered, and larger, mature businesses have exited some sectors. Except for a lull in 1998, the rate of job creation has steadily increased and the rate of job destruction has declined, dropping substantially in 1998–99. “Voluntary” worker separations remain the main—and growing—form of layoff, and the proportion of layoffs through redundancies is shrinking (now about 4 percent of total separations).

Firm size and net employment growth are not statistically related, but form of ownership seems to matter. Firm size is also statistically correlated (positively) with profitability, but restructuring through changes in net employment growth appears not to be. It seems Russian restructuring needs to become more efficient.

---

This paper—a product of the Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Sector Unit, Europe and Central Asia Region—is part of a larger effort in the region to study structural reforms in the Russian Federation. Copies of the paper are available free from the World Bank, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433. Please contact Sandra Craig, room H4-166, telephone 202-473-3160, fax 202-522 2753, email address [scraig@worldbank.org](mailto:scraig@worldbank.org). Policy Research Working Papers are also posted on the Web at <http://econ.worldbank.org>. The authors may be contacted at [hbroadman@worldbank.org](mailto:hbroadman@worldbank.org) or [frecanatini@worldbank.org](mailto:frecanatini@worldbank.org). July 2001. (33 pages)

*The Policy Research Working Paper Series disseminates the findings of work in progress to encourage the exchange of ideas about development issues. An objective of the series is to get the findings out quickly, even if the presentations are less than fully polished. The papers carry the names of the authors and should be cited accordingly. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this paper are entirely those of the authors. They do not necessarily represent the view of the World Bank, its Executive Directors, or the countries they represent.*

# **Is Russia Restructuring?**

## **New Evidence on Job Creation and Destruction**

**Harry G. Broadman\* and Francesca Recanatini\*\***

\* Lead Economist, Europe and Central Asia Regional Operations, The World Bank, Washington, DC.  
[Hbroadman@worldbank.org](mailto:Hbroadman@worldbank.org)

\*\* Economist, World Bank Institute, Governance and Finance Group, The World Bank, Washington, DC.  
[Frecanatini@worldbank.org](mailto:Frecanatini@worldbank.org).

We would like to thank Massimo Mastruzzi for excellent research assistance. This paper benefited from comments on an earlier draft provided by R. Anderson, D. Brown, V. Drebensov, J. Earle, J. Haltiwanger, A. Kuddo, M. Bradshaw, G. Pfefferman, B. Pinto, P. Quanrud, and S. Solnick.



# Is Russia Restructuring?

## New Evidence on Job Creation and Destruction

### I. Introduction

Despite recent signs of economic recovery, due in large part to devaluation of the ruble and increased world oil prices, Russia still faces a daunting challenge to restructure its enterprises. Nowhere is this restructuring task more difficult than in dealing with the immense problem the Russian authorities inherited from the socialist system of ensuring that workers have value-enhancing jobs and a vibrant, flexible labor market that operates according to competitive principles. The ability of Russia's labor market to adapt efficiently to change, where workers are reallocated to boost productivity and output, is critical to achieve sustainable growth. A dynamic labor market—one that facilitates “job creation” in productive enterprises and “job destruction” in unproductive enterprises—is an important factor for all countries making the transition from a centrally planned to a market system.

The record of job creation and job destruction across transition countries has differed greatly. Many Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries have experienced substantial layoffs by state-owned enterprises (SOEs) and a relatively large reallocation of labor from less efficient to more efficient sectors of the economy.<sup>1</sup> The Russian experience, however, has developed along a different path. At the advent of its transition to a market system following the break-up of the Soviet Union in the early 1990s, Russia experienced a major decline in output. It was against this backdrop that Russia's authorities first faced the task of reallocating labor (as well as capital) from insolvent state enterprises towards more productive uses. The federal government began to deregulate wages, abolish guaranteed employment, and reduce formal labor mobility constraints (however all such constraints were not eliminated at the regional level). Perhaps most important, in light of the fact that virtually all aspects of peoples' livelihood and social services were tied to the enterprise sector, the authorities initiated a major drive to privatize state owned enterprises in order to both facilitate restructuring of SOEs and the emergence of new private firms, which in other countries have been major sources of job creation.

But Russia's privatization initiatives have not, for the most part, led to major competitive restructuring of incumbent enterprises. Nor has the country experienced significant growth of *de novo* private sector business, especially compared to other transition countries in Central and Eastern Europe.<sup>2</sup> Predictions of initial large-scale layoffs or dramatic increases in unemployment did not materialize in Russia, and employment adjustment was small relative to output declines. Consistent with this outcome, rates of job destruction during Russia's early transition years were lower than expected, although they have gradually increased over time, and over-manning is still a widespread phenomenon.<sup>3</sup>

There are several reasons why the restructuring of Russian enterprises has been partial and why new private sector start-ups are struggling to emerge, which, in turn, has translated into relatively limited reallocation of labor.<sup>4</sup> The mode of privatization most commonly used relied on worker-management buyouts and thus may not have provided adequate incentives for existing firms to restructure and layoff

---

<sup>1</sup> See IMF, 2000; OECD, 1997.

<sup>2</sup> The chapters in Broadman (1999) diagnose this issue.

<sup>3</sup> Jackman (1998); IMF, 2000.

<sup>4</sup> See Broadman (2000).

workers.<sup>5</sup> Private sector start-ups, particularly small and medium enterprises (SMEs), have faced several barriers to entry, especially at the local level. These include institutional impediments, such as arduous licensing, registration and inspection requirements, corruption, and inadequate legal mechanisms for dispute resolution. Entry has also been blocked by the lack of a competitive environment, engendered by large incumbent enterprises, who retain the structural advantages that come from market dominance, favored access to infrastructure services and protection from inter-regional trade and investment; and by financial sector barriers, which, stemming from the lack of an effective banking system that intermediates saving into investment, have prevented access to credit on commercial terms. Continued state-engendered or state-sponsored “soft” budget constraints on enterprises—in the guise of fiscal subsidies, government tolerance (indeed generation) of non-payments, and the absence of a financial system adhering to commercial lending practices—also have worked to limit cost minimization incentives faced by managers. At the same time, pressure on employers from local governments to maintain employment and reduce the political, social and economic consequences of “open unemployment” has led enterprises to be reluctant to layoff significant amounts of redundant workers. Indeed, keeping a large number of workers on their payrolls may also give enterprise managers more political clout in channeling resources towards themselves. It is also apparent that many managers have acted paternalistically in maintaining employment inasmuch as significant lay-offs would increase poverty among their workers, particularly as the unemployment insurance system does not have adequate resources or sufficient capacity to channel resources to eligible groups.

It has been widely reported that in the years since Russia’s debt default and devaluation of the ruble in August 1998 and the increase in world oil prices, these two factors have produced a significant effect on enterprise restructuring, fostering job destruction and creation, particularly in the country’s manufacturing sector. Indeed, in the aggregate, both separations and new hiring seem to have increased, with the rate of hiring coming closer in 2000 to the rate of separations—although with apparent differences across sectors, regions, firm size and other characteristics that have yet to be systematically documented. Moreover, aggregate data for 2000 show a decline in unemployment. In short, since 1991 the Russian labor market generally has been characterized by only a modest decline in the hiring rates by state enterprises, with relatively few large layoffs, and by limited inter-sectoral reallocation of workers. Labor hoarding has been widespread, while the new private sector has struggled to emerge.

This paper explores the recent dynamics of Russia’s labor market in order to help design policies to improve its functioning during Russia’s continuing transition. To do this it is necessary to unbundle at the firm level the determinants of job creation and destruction in Russian enterprises. Our approach in this regard is to systematically assess empirically the patterns of job creation and destruction over the period 1996-1999 among a large sample of Russian manufacturing businesses in all of the country’s 89 regions. We analyze how the patterns of job creation and destruction at the firm-level are related to various aspects of enterprise restructuring across businesses in different sectors and regions, and with different ownership forms, size, vintage, and performance characteristics.

The main source of our data are official data provided by Goskomstat, Russia’s State Statistical Agency. Economists have struggled to measure the “true” degree of firm restructuring and private sector development in all transition economies (Russia included). The limits of official data collected by government statistical agencies are well-known: a bias toward medium and large enterprises, a lack of systematic information on worker-hours, and perverse incentives for businesses to mis-report employment data. (In an attempt to overcome these limits, some researchers have used survey data.<sup>6</sup>) Thus, we stress at the outset that our dataset has limitations: the enterprises included in the sample are for the most part medium and large size enterprises. This biases our sample and our conclusions towards the labor

---

<sup>5</sup> Nellis (1998) provides an overview.

<sup>6</sup> See, among others, Faggio and Konings (1999); Bilsen and Konings (1998); Haltiwanger and Vodopivec (2000).

dynamics of large, well-established enterprises rather than of small start-up firms. There may be additional measurement issues due to the incentives enterprises have to mis-report to Goskomstat. To overcome some of these limits, we integrate the official data with detailed information gathered through a series of face-to-face case studies of enterprises located in eight of Russia's regions, carried out during 2000. Despite these words of caution, the Goskomstat data set provides unique and rich information on the labor market across 89 Russian oblasts over a period of four years. The use of these data enables us to carry out a more structured statistical investigation of Russian job creation and destruction and enterprise restructuring than has been performed in the past.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In Section II we describe briefly some basic stylized facts regarding job creation and destruction in Russia and compare Russia's experience to other transition economies. Section III analyzes the initial economic conditions and institutional arrangements existing in the Russian labor market to better understand the issues surrounding the determinants of job creation and destruction. Motivated by this discussion, Section IV presents qualitative evidence from newly gathered firm-level data based on the set of regional case studies. The case study results set the stage for the quantitative analysis of the Goskomstat data presented in Section VI.<sup>7</sup> We conclude the paper in Section VII with a detailed summary of our findings.

## **II. Stylized Facts on Job Reallocation in Russia**

To assess the flexibility of the Russian labor market and its link to enterprise restructuring, we concentrate on the behavior of job flows throughout the 1990s, and particularly focus on the period just prior to and subsequent to the economic crisis, devaluation and debt default of 1998. We set the stage for the empirical investigation carried out by first discussing some salient stylized facts on job reallocation observed in Russia (as well as in other transition economies).


Table 1 and Figure 1 present data on the trends in new hiring and separations in Russia's economy from 1993 to 1999. It is apparent that in the industrial sector, except for 1999, both new hiring and separations were quite flat. Only in 1999 does it appear that new hirings have increased, narrowing significantly the gap between hiring and separations. These are trends we will explore in greater detail below with the newly available firm-level data.

**Table 1. Aggregate Data on Labor Turnover in the Russia**

| (Labor Turnover as percent of Total Employment) | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| New Hiring                                      | 21.1 | 20.8 | 22.6 | 18.9 | 19.9 | 21.0 | 23.9 |
| Of which: in industry                           | 20.1 | 18.2 | 21.1 | 16.9 | 19.2 | 19.8 | 27.4 |
| Separations                                     | 25.1 | 27.4 | 25.7 | 23.9 | 24.5 | 24.9 | 24.2 |
| Of which: in industry                           | 28.8 | 32.0 | 28.4 | 27.0 | 26.8 | 27.7 | 27.0 |

*Data in percentage. Source: IMF, 2000.*

<sup>7</sup> A description of the statistical data set is presented in Appendix 1; Appendix 2 defines the basic measures of job creation and destruction utilized.



Source: IMF, 2000.

More generally, to what extent has the Russian labor market been showing increasing flexibility as the transition process has progressed? Until recently, the answer to this question could not be definitive since firm-level data on job flows for Russia have been limited. Labor market phenomena are best measured using micro data, which are not easily available in Russia. To date, the most important sources of micro data on Russian job flows generally were from either specialized (usually one-time) firm-level surveys (such as Konings and Walsh (1999)<sup>8</sup> and Foley (1997)<sup>9</sup> or specialized compilations using data from Goskomstat, such as OECD (1997). These data are summarized in Table 2 and they suggest that although Russia's labor market has been changing, compared to other transition economies, rates of job creation and destruction are lagging behind.

| Table 2. Job Flows in Russia Compared to Selected Transition Economies |              |                 |                  |                       |
|--|--------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Country (years)  | Job Creation | Job Destruction | Job Reallocation | Net Employment Growth |
| <b>Transition Economies</b>  |              |                 |                  |                       |
| Poland (94-97)   | 3.0%         | 3.7%            | 6.7%             | -0.6%                 |
| Estonia (93-97)  | 9.3%         | 8.8%            | 18.1%            | 0.6%                  |
| Slovenia (93-97)   | 3.3%         | 5.4%            | 8.8%             | -2.1%                 |
| Bulgaria (94)  | 1.4%         | 5.2%            | 6.6%             | -3.7%                 |
| Romania (93-97)  | 3.7%         | 9.9%            | 13.6%            | -6.2%                 |
| Hungary (94)   | 1.3%         | 6.6%            | 7.9%             | -5.3%                 |
| Ukraine (96)   | 2.5%         | 15.3%           | 18.0%            | -12.0%                |
| <b>Russia</b>  |              |                 |                  |                       |
| Russia (96)  | 1.2%         | 4.9%            | 6.1%             | -3.7%                 |

Source: Compiled by the authors from data in: OECD, 1997; Faggio and Konings 1999; Konings and Walsh, 1999., Bilsen and Konings, 1998; Davis et al, 1996. From different data sets; not fully comparable.

Note: Job Reallocation = Job Creation + Job Destruction; Net Employment Growth = Job Creation - Job Destruction

<sup>8</sup> The rates were calculated using survey data from 150 enterprises collected in the fall of 1997.

<sup>9</sup> The rates were calculated using data from the Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey, a household-based survey. Round 1 of the survey was implemented in 1992, while the last Round was implemented in 1996.



The OECD, relying on 1997 Goskomstat data, provided some evidence of labor movements taking place in Russia. But these data suggest that as of 1997 deep restructuring of large and medium enterprises had not yet fully materialized. Goskomstat statistics, however, include only limited information on the smallest enterprises and none on firms operating in the shadow economy. This may bias short-term job creation rates downward since it is likely that smaller enterprises absorb a portion of workers separated from larger, restructuring enterprises. Fieldwork we have carried out suggests that small firms often hire directly from large and medium enterprises, creating a shift of labor within industry and facilitating restructuring.

To compensate for the potential bias in the Goskomstat data, some researchers have relied on small firm-level surveys to obtain a more representative picture of the Russian labor market. These survey data provide preliminary evidence that job destruction is much higher, and job creation lower, than the official data suggest—although job creation is still relatively low compared to other countries. (See Table 3)

**Table 3. Differentials in Russian Labor Market Indicators**

| Source<br>(Year)                   | Job creation |      | Job destruction |      |
|------------------------------------|--------------|------|-----------------|------|
|                                    | 1994         | 1995 | 1994            | 1995 |
| Goskomstat                         | 0.7          | 0.9  | 7.3             | 4.0  |
| Faggio – Konings                   | --           | 1.2  | --              | 4.9  |
| Russian Economic Barometer Surveys | 1.0          | 1.7  | 15.9            | 10.1 |

*Data in percentage*

Until now the data available on Russia's labor market has not provided sufficient information to reconcile these existing pieces of evidence and to assess systematically over time, across sectors and inter-regionally the factors that are influencing changes in Russian job creation and destruction. We help fill this vacuum by offering a more complete analysis of the Russian labor market and enterprise restructuring. We do so by using new firm-level data from (i) a larger and more comprehensive data set from Goskomstat than heretofore has been the case, and complementing those data with (ii) new data on smaller firms from a series of detailed qualitative case-studies of individual Russian businesses that we developed in the field in 2000.

### **III. Initial Conditions: Effects on Institutions Russia's Enterprises and Labor Market**

The incentives and constraints on enterprise restructuring and the operation of the labor market in Russia are a function of the initial economic conditions at the start of the country's transition and the institutional environment.

An important attribute of the centrally planned Soviet economy at the time of the founding of the Russian Federation was the artificial geographical distribution of enterprises, the location of which often had less to do with market signals—demand, supply and, in turn, prices—than with the administrative preferences of the State.<sup>10</sup> Industries were often very localized and unevenly distributed across the country. Interregional trade and investment were largely nonexistent. One-company towns are perhaps the most visible manifestation of this.<sup>11</sup> Today Russia's economy is still characterized by these features: there is a hangover from the earlier drive for regional autarky and self-sufficiency, with large firms

<sup>10</sup> Hanson and Bradshaw (forthcoming 2001)

<sup>11</sup> IMC Consulting (1999)

exhibiting excessive vertical integration, protected by local government barriers to interregional trade and investment.<sup>12</sup>

Not surprisingly, by reflection, the hallmark of the Soviet labor market was the presence of significant disparities across regions. Most of what is now the Russian Federation experienced chronic excess demand for labor, while few areas (especially the Central Asian Republics) were characterized by excess supply of labor and open unemployment. Enterprises were continuously searching for additional workers to hire, and guaranteed permanent employment contracts to all workers because it was in the interest of firms to engage in labor hoarding.

Throughout the more than eight years following the dismantling of the Soviet system, the regionally-specialized structure of the economy has had a profound impact on the response of the country's labor market to the reform process.<sup>13</sup> The initial economic disparities across regions and the uneven impact of the reform process on industrial sectors has led to labor gaps across Russia's geography. Over much of this period through the present, regional variations in unemployment rates are extremely high and not declining (see Table 4).

In past years labor turnover exhibited significant regional variations (OECD, 1997). In 1995, for example, separation rates varied from 9.6% in Dagestan to 40.6% in Sakhalin. Gimpelson and Lippoldt (1997) suggest that separations and hiring differences are strongly correlated with the advances made in the transition process. The regional differences in labor turnover seem to closely resemble regional differences in economic development and standards of living. Older, historically Russian regions, lagging behind in the transition to market (such as Voronezh, Penza and Kursk) appear to display the lowest rates of labor turnover. Indeed in the past, labor turnover has been high *within* regions, but not *across* regions. This is likely due to institutional constraints, for example enterprise-tied housing.

More generally, the institutions and regulations directly governing the labor market greatly affect job reallocation by either creating incentives or imposing constraints on employers' and employees' decisions. The Russian labor market is still governed by the 1971 Soviet version of the Labor Code. This code contains a myriad of detailed rules regulating many aspects of the employer-employee relationship. In practice, however, the importance of this law has declined since 1991 due to discrepancies between the code's unrealistically rigid provisions and the needs of a growing market economy. This has resulted in lack of enforcement of the minimum wage, high incidence of illegal administrative leave, and wage arrears.

Nonetheless, enterprises are still responsible to provide non-wage social benefits to their employees and face severe legal restrictions in severing labor contracts. The lack of reforms in the social sector has also helped to maintain serious rigidities in the labor market.<sup>14</sup> Thus, the anachronistic Labor Code, the inadequacy of the social safety net, and significant political pressures—especially at the local level—have constrained labor movements and prevented the much needed restructuring of firms.

---

<sup>12</sup> Broadman (2000)

<sup>13</sup> Ortung (2000).

<sup>14</sup> An interesting example of successful labor market reforms paired with social programs is Estonia. For a detail discussion, see Haltiwanger and Vodopevec (1999).

**Table 4. Russian Unemployment Rate by Regions (ILO methodology), 1993-99**  
(in percent of labor force)

|                                 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| <b>Northern Region</b>          |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Karelian Republic               | 7.8  | 8.7  | 13.2 | 11.5 | 11.9 | 16.6 | 15.8 |
| Komi Republic                   | 4.9  | 9.3  | 10.9 | 10.4 | 13.9 | 17.8 | 16.1 |
| Arkhangel'sk Oblast             | 6.1  | 9.7  | 11.0 | 12.0 | 12.4 | 14.9 | 14.9 |
| Nenets Autonomous Okrug         | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 13.3 | 11.3 | 20.1 |
| Vologodsk Oblast                | 4.2  | 7.6  | 8.8  | 8.0  | 10.5 | 12.7 | 11.8 |
| Murmansk Oblast                 | 6.5  | 9.1  | 12.4 | 14.7 | 18.5 | 21.0 | 16.3 |
| <b>North-western Region</b>     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Saint Petersburg                | 8.0  | 9.9  | 10.6 | 10.3 | 9.9  | 11.3 | 11.0 |
| Leningrad Oblast                | 6.7  | 9.4  | 10.2 | 10.0 | 12.8 | 15.0 | 14.8 |
| Novgorod Oblast                 | 5.8  | 8.3  | 10.2 | 9.1  | 13.5 | 15.4 | 14.5 |
| Pskov Oblast                    | 7.9  | 12.4 | 12.2 | 13.7 | 14.2 | 16.1 | 14.1 |
| <b>Central Region</b>           |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Bryansk Oblast                  | 4.7  | 8.8  | 9.4  | 8.2  | 12.9 | 15.7 | 16.7 |
| Vladimir Oblast                 | 5.9  | 10.0 | 13.1 | 11.5 | 11.6 | 12.0 | 13.1 |
| Ivanovo Oblast                  | 8.4  | 13.6 | 14.6 | 16.5 | 16.9 | 18.8 | 17.7 |
| Kaluzhsk Oblast                 | 5.1  | 5.7  | 8.3  | 7.8  | 11.2 | 10.2 | 11.6 |
| Kostromska Oblast               | 8.1  | 9.5  | 9.4  | 9.9  | 9.4  | 11.2 | 10.1 |
| Moscow                          | 6.5  | 7.7  | 7.0  | 6.3  | 4.8  | 4.8  | 5.6  |
| Moscow Oblast                   | 5.1  | 7.0  | 7.9  | 7.6  | 8.8  | 9.9  | 10.7 |
| Orlov Oblast                    | 4.5  | 6.5  | 8.0  | 9.6  | 9.8  | 13.2 | 9.2  |
| Ryazan Oblast                   | 5.1  | 6.6  | 6.7  | 6.4  | 10.1 | 7.1  | 12.8 |
| Smolensk Oblast                 | 6.5  | 7.8  | 10.2 | 11.3 | 12.9 | 16.4 | 14.2 |
| Tver Oblast                     | 4.0  | 6.7  | 8.2  | 5.7  | 9.9  | 11.3 | 10.4 |
| Tula Oblast                     | 4.1  | 6.7  | 6.2  | 6.9  | 10.0 | 11.6 | 11.6 |
| Yaroslavl Oblast                | 5.6  | 8.5  | 12.1 | 10.8 | 8.8  | 11.1 | 8.8  |
| <b>Volga Region</b>             |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Marii-El Republic               | 4.8  | 9.4  | 11.8 | 11.3 | 18.0 | 13.1 | 10.8 |
| Mordoviya Republic              | 6.3  | 8.1  | 11.6 | 13.1 | 12.2 | 14.5 | 12.8 |
| Chuvash Republic                | 7.1  | 10.0 | 10.2 | 11.1 | 13.9 | 13.9 | 13.9 |
| Kirov Oblast                    | 6.1  | 9.7  | 9.2  | 8.9  | 11.4 | 13.1 | 10.1 |
| Nizhegorod Oblast               | 5.2  | 6.6  | 8.7  | 9.0  | 9.7  | 9.1  | 7.7  |
| <b>Central-Chernozem Region</b> |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Belgorod Oblast                 | 4.4  | 5.5  | 6.1  | 6.6  | 10.7 | 11.3 | 13.1 |
| Voronezh Oblast                 | 4.4  | 5.6  | 8.2  | 9.2  | 8.1  | 9.5  | 12.5 |
| Kurst Oblast                    | 3.8  | 6.4  | 6.1  | 7.4  | 8.1  | 10.2 | 11.5 |
| Lipetsk Oblast                  | 5.2  | 5.7  | 6.3  | 6.7  | 9.8  | 11.1 | 11.1 |
| Tambov Oblast                   | 5.8  | 7.5  | 10.6 | 11.1 | 12.9 | 12.7 | 14.3 |
| <b>Povolgski Region</b>         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Kalmykiya Republic              | 9.1  | 12.1 | 22.2 | 14.5 | 26.1 | 30.8 | 25.5 |
| Tatarstan Republic              | 3.6  | 6.1  | 6.5  | 6.5  | 7.9  | 10.9 | 11.4 |
| Astrakhan Oblast                | 7.3  | 9.7  | 14.7 | 12.8 | 14.6 | 15.9 | 14.1 |
| Volgograd Oblast                | 5.6  | 7.6  | 11.5 | 11.2 | 50.0 | 14.7 | 12.5 |
| Penzensk Oblast                 | 6.4  | 8.9  | 13.9 | 14.9 | 12.0 | 18.1 | 11.6 |
| Samara Oblast                   | 4.6  | 6.3  | 8.0  | 8.7  | 9.3  | 8.6  | 12.4 |
| Saratov Oblast                  | 5.9  | 8.9  | 10.4 | 10.5 | 15.8 | 16.1 | 11.2 |
| Ulyanov Oblast                  | 4.8  | 6.5  | 8.3  | 8.2  | 9.8  | 11.1 | 9.2  |

Continued on next page.

|                                 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| North-Kaukaz Region             |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Adygeya Republic                | 8.0  | 13.0 | 12.4 | 11.1 | 12.3 | 16.0 | 21.1 |
| Dagestan Republic               | 17.5 | 18.0 | 25.3 | 27.7 | 27.0 | 30.0 | 31.2 |
| Ingush Republic                 | ---  | ---  | 43.1 | 32.2 | 58.2 | 51.1 | 51.8 |
| Kabardino-Balkar Republic       | 9.6  | 14.3 | 14.3 | 17.1 | 17.7 | 22.4 | 28.2 |
| Karachaev-Circassian Republic   | 9.6  | 11.3 | 27.4 | 20.8 | 18.9 | 25.5 | 22.4 |
| North Ossetian-Alaniya Republic | ---  | ---  | 23.3 | 30.1 | 22.2 | 26.6 | 33.4 |
| Chechen Republic                |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Krasnodarsk Krai                | 7.2  | 8.6  | 9.3  | 10.7 | 16.5 | 16.2 | 15.9 |
| Stavropol Krai                  | 6.2  | 5.6  | 9.4  | 9.8  | 13.9 | 16.3 | 19.2 |
| Rostov Oblast                   | 5.6  | 7.8  | 8.5  | 8.5  | 12.0 | 15.7 | 18.5 |
| Ural                            |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Bashkortostan Republic          | 4.3  | 6.7  | 7.8  | 7.9  | 11.2 | 13.4 | 12.5 |
| Udmurt Republic                 | 6.2  | 8.7  | ---  | 13.1 | 12.1 | 13.1 | 11.6 |
| Kurgan Oblast                   | 5.6  | 9.5  | 8.4  | 10.2 | 12.5 | 13.1 | 13.4 |
| Orenburg Oblast                 | 3.3  | 6.2  | 7.5  | 5.5  | 9.5  | 13.4 | 14.2 |
| Perm Oblast                     | 5.7  | 8.4  | 9.0  | 8.8  | 11.1 | 13.0 | 14.3 |
| Komi-Permyatsk Autonomous Okr   | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 17.6 | 17.4 | 10.5 |
| Sverdlovsk Oblast               | 6.2  | 8.2  | 8.5  | 8.5  | 10.2 | 10.5 | 13.9 |
| Chelyabinsk Oblast              | 6.5  | 8.2  | 8.2  | 8.7  | 9.5  | 12.4 | 12.0 |
| West Sibera                     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Altai Republic                  | 9.3  | 13.5 | 9.9  | 13.2 | 18.4 | 18.5 | 19.4 |
| Altai Krai                      | 6.7  | 8.4  | 11.1 | 10.7 | 13.9 | 16.0 | 13.1 |
| Kemerovo Oblast                 | 4.9  | 7.2  | 6.6  | 6.8  | 11.2 | 12.5 | 13.8 |
| Novosibirsk Oblast              | 6.7  | 8.1  | 10.1 | 8.9  | 10.7 | 13.7 | 15.0 |
| Omsk Oblast                     | 5.4  | 7.6  | 5.4  | 7.0  | 13.4 | 15.5 | 15.0 |
| Tomsk Oblast                    | 7.6  | 10.2 | 7.9  | 7.9  | 12.8 | 14.6 | 16.5 |
| Tyumen Oblast                   | 5.1  | 7.5  | 6.9  | 9.2  | 8.9  | 14.0 | 11.3 |
| Khanti-Mansi Autonomous Okrug   | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 12.5 | 14.4 | 11.3 |
| Yamalo-Nenets Autonomous Okr    | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 10.7 | 11.2 | 10.0 |
| East Sibera                     |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Buryat Republic                 | 5.8  | 9.8  | 15.1 | 14.6 | 21.3 | 22.1 | 18.1 |
| Tyva Republic                   | 6.5  | 11.0 | 21.4 | 18.1 | 22.0 | 20.9 | 26.0 |
| Khakasian Republic              | 4.6  | 6.2  | 8.7  | 11.6 | 13.0 | 9.6  | 16.1 |
| Krasnoyarsk Krai                | 5.4  | 8.3  | 9.0  | 8.1  | 13.3 | 16.4 | 14.3 |
| Taimyrsk Autonomous Okrug       | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 7.0  | 15.6 | 9.7  |
| Evenkisk Autonomous Okrug       | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 3.4  | 5.9  | 7.2  |
| Irkutsk Oblast                  | 6.2  | 8.3  | 8.9  | 11.2 | 14.4 | 13.7 | 15.1 |
| Ust-Ordinsk Buryat Autonomous   | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 7.7  | 8.4  | 14.9 |
| Chitinsk Oblast                 | 5.8  | 7.1  | 9.2  | 14.9 | 18.5 | 20.4 | 21.0 |
| Aginsk Buryat A. Okrug          | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 28.1 | 35.7 | 23.5 |
| Far East Region                 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Sakha Republic (Yakutiya)       | 3.9  | 6.0  | 7.1  | 6.7  | 12.6 | 13.6 | 13.9 |
| Jewish Autonomous Oblast        | 5.6  | 11.7 | 17.0 | 12.6 | 25.1 | 23.9 | 19.0 |
| Chukotsk A. Oblast              | ---  | ---  | ---  | ---  | 8.4  | 4.7  | 9.3  |
| Primorye Krai                   | 5.4  | 7.5  | 10.0 | 9.6  | 13.3 | 14.9 | 13.7 |
| Khabarovsk Krai                 | 6.8  | 9.2  | 11.4 | 12.1 | 12.7 | 12.4 | 14.4 |
| Amur Oblast                     | 5.3  | 8.7  | 13.4 | 11.0 | 15.6 | 16.9 | 16.4 |
| Kamchatka Oblast                | 5.6  | 9.7  | 6.8  | 7.0  | 12.5 | 17.6 | 18.2 |
| Koryak Autonomous Okrug         |      |      |      |      | 6.8  | 8.4  | 8.9  |
| Magadan Oblast                  | 6.3  | 10.9 | 9.7  | 10.4 | 13.6 | 18.1 | 20.6 |
| Sakhalin Oblast                 | 8.0  | 9.9  | 11.3 | 10.9 | 15.0 | 17.1 | 20.7 |
| Kaliningrad Oblast              | 7.1  | 9.6  | 9.2  | 13.9 | 11.5 | 16.7 | 15.9 |


Source: IMF, 2000.

For the economy as a whole, in light of the limited flexibility of the Russian labor market, it is not surprising that gross employment adjustments have been well behind movements in aggregate output, as depicted in Table 5 and Figure 2. The rate of unemployment has increased almost steadily since the beginning of the transition, reflecting considerable excess labor and constraints to lay-offs and new business entry. Importantly, in the past year this trend appears to have been stabilized and even begun to reverse, owing, in part, to the strong growth in GDP in the wake of the August 1998 devaluation and the rise in world oil prices.

**Table 5. GDP and Unemployment in Russia, 1991-99**

| Year  | 1991 | 1992  | 1993 | 1994  | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 |
|---|------|-------|------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|
| GDP <sup>15</sup>                           | -5.0 | -14.5 | -8.7 | -12.7 | -4.1 | -3.4 | 0.9  | -4.9 | 3.2  |
| Unemployment (annual average) <sup>16</sup> | 0.0  | 5.2   | 6.1  | 7.8   | 9.0  | 10.0 | 11.2 | 13.3 | 11.9 |

Source: IMF, 2000.



Source: authors' calculations from IMF (2000).

From a structural policy perspective, however, the key determinants explaining these trends—both in the past and what the future may portend—lie at the microeconomic level. In particular, the focus must be on analyzing which factors most directly influence the linkages between enterprise restructuring (including business formation), on the one hand, and job creation and destruction, on the other. The first prong of our analytical approach is to present the results of a series of qualitative case studies. The second prong is to analyze statistically the firm-level data set assembled by Goskomstat.

<sup>15</sup> Percentage change in real terms.

<sup>16</sup> Percentage change, in per cent of labor force; calculated according to the ILO definition.

#### **IV. Case-Study Evidence**

In-depth interviews of general directors and other senior management of more than 70 enterprises and banks were carried out in 2000 in eight Russian regions: Krasnodar Krai, Leningrad Oblast, St. Petersburg city, Moscow Oblast, Moscow city, Novgorod Oblast, Novosibirsk Oblast, and Primorski Krai. We summarize here the key findings from these case studies.

*Some job destruction has occurred, but many firms are still over-employed.* The majority of the managers interviewed indicated that the level of employment in their enterprises has declined since the beginning of the transition in the early 1990s. But most also indicated that more downsizing was necessary to bring the scale of plants in line with market conditions. Thus further restructuring of incumbent enterprises was deemed necessary. The limited reduction in personnel observed was attributed for the most part to retirements and voluntary separations rather than to actual lay-offs at the managers' initiative. It was apparent that due to political pressure and a lingering Soviet "corporate culture", managers responded to the worsening in economic conditions and the decline in demand by accumulating wage arrears, shortening employees' workday and imposing forced leave without pay or with partial pay, rather than laying off employees. At the same time, some of managers interviewed conceded that, given the actual demand for their firms' products, their enterprises are still over-manned by at least 10-15%. This trend of implicit or temporary unemployment is especially common among well-established, older enterprises (either SOEs, or privatized firms) in the more traditionally manufacturing sectors. Certain distortions in the policy environment, for example the tax regime, also play a role in creating incentives and constraints on job destruction; see Box 1.

*Although some job creation has materialized, there is potential for much more.* In contrast with the evidence gathered regarding the older enterprises, including previously privatized firms, newcomers in the market, particularly *de novo* smaller firms, appear to have been at the forefront of creating new jobs—although it is too early to tell from the interviews how durable these new jobs will be (i.e., whether or not there is net positive employment growth). Job creation was found to be particularly strong in light industry, especially enterprises in the food, retail and information technology (IT) sectors, and also in natural resource-related firms (those in or associated with oil or natural gas). Moreover, the creation of new jobs appears to be more marked since the 1998 devaluation, likely because of the import substitution effects, particularly in trade-sensitive sectors, for example, timber and wood processing.

##### **Box 1. Is It Real Job Reallocation? A Construction Firm in Moscow Oblast**

Established in the early 1950s, this large company producing construction materials has undergone several transformations since 1991. To be able to survive the worsened economic conditions and minimize the burden of taxation, the senior management decided to divide the original company into about 30 separate enterprises. These firms are *de facto* departments of the "mother" company, but are legally separate entities. The newly established firms and the mother company are in constant re-organization depending on the needs of the mother company and changes in tax incentives and credits available to small businesses. The "subsidiary" companies are kept "alive" until they are profitable and then are closed down. Workers, on the other hand, have been continuously moved from one subsidiary to another, displaying trust toward the management and a great level of mobility, since each time a subsidiary closes down, the employees are laid-off with simply the implicit understanding that they will be later re-hired in another subsidiary. Nonetheless this fictitious closing down and opening of the subsidiaries, and the continuous flows and reflows of employees between different jobs—apparently largely on the basis of tax incentives and disincentives—leads to significantly distorted measures of job creation and destruction.

Source: authors

There is significant variation across sectors and regions in the incidence of job creation and destruction observed. Although the case studies reveal some regularities, different sectors and regions have responded differently to the transition in terms of job creation and destruction. Light industry and the services, retail, and information technology sectors, for example, are clearly in expansion, as well as are export-oriented and import-substituting enterprises as a consequence of the 1998 devaluation and increased oil prices. More traditional manufacturing sectors, for example, heavy industry, machine tools, and chemicals (among others), however, are still struggling to recover. Among the eight regions visited, there are also significant differences in the patterns in employment flows and enterprise restructuring. More progressive and reform-oriented regional administrations, such as Novgorod, have promoted new entry, enterprise restructuring and a more flexible labor market through judicious economic and fiscal policies, bolstered by greater policy stability and transparency; see Box 2. Other regions, however, have been less helpful in creating a more favorable business environment, hampering the restructuring process. Many regional administrations employ protectionist policies to insulate “local champions” from competition, for example in hampering inter-regional trade flows.

Enterprise restructuring and downsizing is hampered due to protectionist institutions and policies. Many general directors indicated that their enterprises are still responsible for providing social services—such as housing, hospitals, schools and training centers—for both their current and former employees. This situation, a hangover Soviet corporate mentality, creates a web of deep ties between the firm and employees that unduly complicates the restructuring process, where the ties remain even after the formal employer-employee relationship is terminated. Other transition economies, such as China, exhibit similar protectionist policies, which have retarded labor reallocation.<sup>17</sup> Portions of Russia’s existing employment regulations, especially the Labor Code, appear to complicate the situation further, making it difficult for enterprises to lay off redundant employees. On the other hand, the regulations do have an impact on the type of contracts that employers who are faced with redundancy challenges prefer to offer to prospective employees since employers have a strong preference for temporary and seasonal hiring.

#### **Box 2. Promoting Restructuring and Job Creation: The Economic Council of Novgorod**

Since the mid 1950s, the Novgorod region developed as a production center for radio-electronics, especially for the military sector (for many firms military orders accounted for up to 70% of their production). The transition process led the region into a deep economic crisis, since most of its industry was unable to compete in a market-based environment because of the halting of military orders; outdated technologies; and lack of trained labor. In 1992, the oblast administration reassessed the business environment and decided to launch a multi-pronged strategy to reduce unemployment. It established the Economic Council of Novgorod with the purpose of formulating economic policies to revitalize the regional economy. The Council focused on three areas of economic policy: (1) development of small businesses, so as to promote growth and new jobs; (2) administration of more effective tax collection, so as to reduce the regional dependency from the federal budget; and (3) creation of a favorable investment conditions for out-of-oblast investors. Whereas the tax issues are still not resolved (the oblast is still federally subsidized to the amount of 12.5% of its budget), the employment goal has met with some success. As of mid-2000 one fourth of the local population is employed by small businesses, and tax receipts from SMEs account for one fifth of the budget revenues. The biggest success has come however from attracting FDI to the region (currently some US\$800 million), following the adoption of several investment promotion programs and the formation of a transparent and stable investment policy regime at the regional level. In 1999 62% of the oblast’s gross product came from ventures with foreign participation, and the oblast’s exports were four times the size of its imports.

Source: authors

<sup>17</sup> See Lane, Broadman and Singh (1997) for analysis of labor creation and destruction in Chinese enterprises.

7

One of the constraints expanding firms face is their ability to find expert workers. Many managers interviewed report that they currently face several impediments to increase their labor force—despite stronger demand for their products. In part their attempts to expand production capacity are hampered by the lack of skilled labor, especially for the newly emerging IT and computer sectors. Indeed, a common complaint among general directors is the difficulty of attracting particular types of experts. This is due in part to the surge in recent demand for new skills but without the matching supply of requisite workers—for example skills in modern management techniques and in specialized areas such as computer software; see Box 3. Although most firms acknowledge that a large part of the problem is that they are unable to offer competitive wages, the shortage also is the result of constraints reflected in limited regional mobility within the country and outdated training programs.

### **Box 3. Lack of Skilled Workers -- An IT Firm in Novosibirsk Oblast**

Established in 1991, this IT firm has expanded rapidly over the past 10 years, growing from 3 to about 300 employees. Its growth however has been constrained by the lack of available skilled labor in the software field and in modern management techniques. Especially since the crisis in August 1998, the firm has tried to increase its capacity and compete on the Russian market with foreign enterprises. Its recruitment efforts, through headhunters, its web site newspaper advertisements and its informal network, have all been hampered by the lack of the firm's internal marketing skills and an incomplete strategic vision. If possible, in the coming year, this firm would like to increase its management staff by 10 percent, and its overall personnel by approximately 30 percent.

Source: authors

The lack of skilled labor is increasing the economic gaps between Russian regions. Regions with well-established, state-of-the-art universities, for example, Novosibirsk, appear to be restructuring at a somewhat faster pace and attracting investment. Relatively few managers indicated that in order to overcome the shortage of skilled labor would the firm—at this juncture—hire unskilled labor and provide in-house training, although in the case of senior positions, training would be provided to new employees.

Job reallocation is hampered because workers are reluctant or face constraints to move to different regions or even within a region. The limited availability of skilled labor is also exacerbated by workers' unwillingness to move, especially outside urban centers, in part because of housing endowments they enjoy in their current locality, local residency requirements that act as constraints on new worker entrants (for example in the city of Moscow) or poor transport links. Despite substantial improvements since the start of the transition, worker mobility across Russia's regions is still quite limited. This creates unnecessary bottlenecks in the labor market, retards enterprise restructuring, and increases the wage and economic disparities across regions.

Worker recruitment still occurs mostly through informal and personal networks. Job creation is unlikely to be efficiently carried out because of the lack of competitive and transparent hiring practices. Many managers indicated that they tend to rely more on their personal contacts for worker searches, especially when hiring blue-collar workers. Using newspaper advertising or head-hunters is more common when the firm is looking for specialized labor and senior workers. Managers also rely heavily on their current employees to spread by word-of-mouth that there are job openings in the firm and to let friends know of recruitment possibilities.



Enterprise restructuring and job reallocation are also being stifled because of obsolete technologies and lack of financing. Many managers acknowledge that their production lines are outdated, inefficient and excessively labor intensive. Yet most managers indicated extreme difficulty in obtaining financial credit from banks or other sources, including government agencies, for medium term investment needs on “commercial terms” they find acceptable. Conditional on access to financial capital, many would seek to automate their production lines in the next few years. If consummated properly and in line with true market demand, such investments would likely translate into significant job destruction (for low skilled jobs) and job creation (for expert personnel).

## **V. Statistical Analysis: Quantitative Evidence Across Russia’s 89 Regions**

Recently available firm-level data from Goskomstat covering approximately 128,000 enterprises across 24 industrial sectors in all of the country’s 89 regions for the years 1996-1999 permit new microeconomic analysis of enterprise restructuring and labor reallocation in Russia. Here we present the main findings from this analysis.

***Enterprise Restructuring in the Aggregate.*** Table 6 summarizes key attributes of the restructuring that has taken place among Russian enterprises between 1996 through the end of 1999. One measure of the amount of firm restructuring is the change in the number of registered firms between 1996-99. Although the change has been small in the aggregate, with only a 1.3% increase, there is significant variation across sectors. Sectors where the number of registered firms has decreased substantially include clothing, shoes, tanning, furs, electronics and light industry. Substantial increases in number of firm registries have occurred in the fishing, pulp and paper, and woodworking sectors. Of course, number of firms registered is a (perhaps highly) imperfect measure of economic restructuring: it contains no information about changes in firm scale (i.e., whether it is a large or a small firm that is registering or de-registering) and it also may reflect administrative/legal changes rather than economic changes (i.e., when an existing firm simply re-registers under a new name).

For these reasons it is critical to look at number of employees (columns 4 and 5 of Table 6). First we note that the average size firm in the Goskomstat data is 355 employees, which is slightly above the normative definition of a “small enterprise” in Russia (usually 250 employees<sup>18</sup>), but in some sectors—notably information and computer services, clothing, light industry, meat and dairy, among others—the Goskomstat data do contain firms whose average size does fit the “small enterprise” definition. In contrast to the data on registration, the data on number of employees show that moderate downsizing—of almost 12 percent—has occurred in the typical firm between 1996-99. As with the registration measure, there is great variability across sectors in the change of number of employees. But the data on employee numbers give a richer picture: for example, in the woodworking, pulp and paper, meat and dairy, and fishing sectors, the average number of employees per firm has in fact decreased even though the number of registered firms in these sectors has increased—suggesting that these market structures have rationalized and smaller firms have been entering these businesses, a finding consistent with our case studies, including the impact of the ruble devaluation on trade sensitive sectors. In light industry, however, although there has been a decrease in the number of firms registered, the average number of employees per firm has increased, suggesting an upsizing in firm scale has been taking place. In contrast, the employee downsizing in the mechanical engineering for light industry, electronics and precision tools, which was consistent with the decrease in registered firms in these businesses, suggests in such sectors enterprises have been exiting from the market.

---

<sup>18</sup> Within the Russian nomenclature this standard varies somewhat across sectors.

**Table 6. Russian Enterprise Restructuring and Performance: 1996 – 1999**

|   | Number of Registered Firms Providing Complete Balance Sheet Information <sup>19</sup> |                 | Average Size (number of employees) |                 | Reporting year Payroll (in '000 rubles) | Sale Revenues (in '000 rubles) | Rate of Return (profits over assets) | Rate of Return (profits over assets) |
|---|---|-----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|   | As of end 99  | Δ(99-96)        | As of end 99                       | Δ(99-96)        | (average) 1999                          | (average) 1999                 | (average) 1996                       | (average) 1999                       |
| <b>Industry</b>                                 | <b>As of end 99</b>   | <b>Δ(99-96)</b> | <b>As of end 99</b>                | <b>Δ(99-96)</b> | <b>1999</b>                             | <b>1999</b>                    | <b>1996</b>                          | <b>1999</b>                          |
| Ferrous metallurgy                              | 973   | -2.6%           | 2366                               | -12.3%          | 10728                                   | 149519                         | 1.6%                                 | 39.2%                                |
| Non ferrous metallurgy                          | 1584  | 15.8%           | 1245                               | -9.6%           | 8600                                    | 113855                         | 19.9%                                | 62.9%                                |
| Chemical industry                               | 3827  | 18.1%           | 1026                               | -3.7%           | 1815                                    | 22895                          | -1.1%                                | 21.5%                                |
| Mechanical engineering                          | 2930  | 1.0%            | 718                                | -23.4%          | 2440                                    | 23309                          | 5.8%                                 | 9.8%                                 |
| Machine tool and tool industry                  | 1030  | -14.2%          | 356                                | -23.9%          | 824                                     | 6286                           | 1.8%                                 | 8.5%                                 |
| Precision tool industry                         | 1309  | -12.6%          | 508                                | -30.1%          | 797                                     | 7078                           | 2.1%                                 | 19.6%                                |
| Tractor and agricultural mechanical engineering | 463   | -1.9%           | 908                                | -29.2%          | 2869                                    | 25379                          | 4.6%                                 | 3.2%                                 |
| Mechanical engineering for light industry       | 950   | -6.3%           | 348                                | -47.7%          | 669                                     | 6643                           | 0.2%                                 | -11.3%                               |
| Electronic industry                             | 983   | -20.4%          | 411                                | -43.8%          | 714                                     | 4888                           | -2.8%                                | 9.1%                                 |
| Metal construction and articles industry        | 3878  | -0.5%           | 239                                | 4.6%            | 271                                     | 3742                           | 5.1%                                 | 17.9%                                |
| Woodworking industry                            | 4155  | 27.7%           | 211                                | -47.4%          | 696                                     | 4908                           | -7.9%                                | 10.6%                                |
| Wood processing industry                        | 9587  | -5.2%           | 230                                | -2.6%           | 309                                     | 3316                           | -3.3%                                | 12.4%                                |
| Pulp and paper industry                         | 734   | 31.9%           | 788                                | -22.5%          | 3525                                    | 54402                          | -2.3%                                | 43.6%                                |
| Timber-chemical industry                        | 39  | 2.6%            | 433                                | 2.5%            | 1290                                    | 11389                          | 1.5%                                 | 4.2%                                 |
| Building material industry                      | 6614  | -9.5%           | 249                                | -8.8%           | 758                                     | 6537                           | 2.1%                                 | 5.0%                                 |
| Glass and porcelain industry                    | 647   | -0.5%           | 540                                | -11.5%          | 1236                                    | 10580                          | 4.6%                                 | 20.7%                                |
| Textile industry                                | 2417  | -14.9%          | 359                                | -23.1%          | 856                                     | 7277                           | -1.8%                                | 6.7%                                 |
| Clothing industry                               | 7529  | -25.4%          | 125                                | -9.6%           | 136                                     | 1358                           | 2.2%                                 | 19.4%                                |
| Tanning, fur and shoes industry                 | 2752  | -32.5%          | 193                                | -4.7%           | 259                                     | 2524                           | -0.6%                                | 10.6%                                |
| Other light industry                            | 75  | -40.0%          | 170                                | 26.5%           | 301                                     | 2210                           | 0.8%                                 | 18.9%                                |
| Food gustatory industry                         | 10420   | 14.1%           | 238                                | 5.5%            | 1055                                    | 15917                          | 14.0%                                | 31.7%                                |
| Meat and dairy industry                         | 4806  | 14.2%           | 184                                | -20.7%          | 766                                     | 16500                          | 5.8%                                 | 7.7%                                 |
| Fish industry                                   | 2562  | 36.4%           | 294                                | -47.3%          | 789                                     | 10169                          | -4.8%                                | -1.5%                                |
| Information and computer services               | 3961  | 11.8%           | 57                                 | 5.3%            | 102                                     | 1556                           | 21.9%                                | 2.4%                                 |
| <b>Russia (average)</b>                         | <b>74225</b>  | <b>1.30%</b>    | <b>355</b>                         | <b>-11.50%</b>  | <b>1028</b>                             | <b>12794</b>                   | <b>2.9%</b>                          | <b>15.5%</b>                         |

Source: authors' calculations using data from Goskomstat

The effects of the 1998 devaluation and ensuing industrial growth in Russia are evident in terms of changes in firm performance, in particular, profitability. As indicated in the last two columns of Table 6, the overall average rate of return on assets increased from 2.9 percent in 1996 to 15.5 percent in 1999. Profitability in 1999 was highest in the non-ferrous and ferrous metals, pulp and paper, and food sectors; and losses were suffered in the mechanical engineering for light industry and fishing sectors. Sectors whose rates of return declined in 1999 relative to 1996, in addition to the mechanical engineering for light industry and fishing sectors, also include information and computer services and tractor and agricultural

<sup>19</sup> Although the size of our panel data is 128,000 firms over four years, only about 80,000 enterprises provided complete and consistent information for each of the four years. Our analysis and the annual rates of job creation and destruction constructed are therefore based on a set of about 80,000 enterprises.

machinery. The data indicate that in 1999 greater profitability is associated with larger firm size: the correlation between revenues and rate of return on assets is about 0.7 and is statistically significant.

***Job Creation and Destruction in the Aggregate.*** Table 7 and Figure 3 display the extent of job creation, destruction, and reallocation as well as net employment growth, aggregated across all regions and sectors for the 1996-1999 period.

The data indicate several important findings. Except for a lull in 1998, there has been a steady increase in the rate of job creation since 1996, especially between 1999 and 1998. But at the same time, job destruction rates have been declining over the same period, again with a substantial drop in the 1998-99 period. This suggests that, all other things equal, the rate of layoffs in enterprises has been decreasing, especially in the post-crisis period.

These two outcomes result in the fact that although *net employment growth*—the excess of job creation over job destruction—in Russia is still negative, there is substantially less negative net employment growth today—at -1.6 percent—than there was in 1996, when net employment growth was -8.9 percent. These data also indicate, however, that although net employment growth rates are growing, the extent of job reallocation—the sum of job destruction and job creation rates—has declined, suggesting that overall job flows in Russia’s labor market are decreasing.<sup>20</sup>

| <b>Table 7. Russia’s Job Creation, Destruction, and Reallocation; Net Employment Growth: 1996-1999</b><br>(rates in percentage) |                     |                        |                         |                              |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Year/Year</b>  | <b>Job Creation</b> | <b>Job Destruction</b> | <b>Job Reallocation</b> | <b>Net Employment Growth</b> |
| 97 vs. 96   | 9.9                 | 18.8                   | 28.7                    | -8.9                         |
| 98 vs. 97   | 9.7                 | 17.7                   | 27.4                    | -8                           |
| 99 vs. 98   | 12.2                | 13.8                   | 26                      | -1.6                         |


*Note:* Job Reallocation = Job Creation + Job Destruction; Net Employment Growth = Job Creation - Job Destruction

*Source:* Authors’ calculations using data from Goskomstat. For a detailed description of the methodology and definitions, see Appendix II. These rates were calculated using a subset of the Goskomstat dataset because of missing data and inconsistencies.

***Job Creation and Destruction: Does Firm Size Make a Difference?*** A key issue is the extent to which job creation and job destruction rates differ according to firm size. For a simple assessment of this at the sectoral level, the correlations between average firm size in 1999 (measured either by number of employees or sales revenues) and job creation or job destruction rates in 1999 vs 1998 are both negative, but neither, however, is statistically significantly different from zero—suggesting that, at this juncture in Russia, firm size and net employment growth do not appear to be related.<sup>21</sup> Figure 4 illustrates this finding. Of course, to investigate this question more comprehensively, there is a need to focus on within- and cross-sectoral effects, as well as on within- and cross-oblast differences.

<sup>20</sup> This slowing down of the labor market could be attributed in part to the evolution of the transition process itself. At the beginning of the transition, a large reallocation of resources from inefficient to more efficient uses was necessary. As the transition proceeded and resources were reallocated, the rate of job reallocation got closer to U.S. and European levels.

<sup>21</sup> This result does not change if we eliminate outliers from the analysis.



**Job Creation and Destruction: Does Enterprise Ownership Form Matter?** There is great variation in rates of job creation and destruction among firms of different ownership form; see Table 8 and Figure 5. Between 1996 and 1999, rates of job creation and job destruction have been higher in public compared to private enterprises. For both ownership forms, however, job creation rates increased and job destruction rates decreased between 1996 and 1999. Moreover, net employment growth has been negative for public as well as private enterprises (but less so particularly after 1998). But private enterprises exhibit substantially less negative net employment growth than do their public sector counterparts, suggesting that more layoffs are occurring among public enterprises. Importantly, the differentials in net employment growth rates between the two ownership forms, however, has narrowed significantly, from 9 percent in 1997/96 to about 3 percent in 1999/98, suggesting that the overall pace of labor market flows is becoming more similar among public and private enterprises.

The patterns of job reallocation among enterprises with foreign ownership have been significantly different from domestic firms. For fully foreign owned firms, both job creation and job destruction rates were significantly higher than those of domestic public and private enterprises in the 1997-96 period (joint ventures' rates were more in line with those of domestic firms.) But whereas job creation rates for domestic firms rose between 1996 and 1999, for foreign owned firms, they actually fell and did so significantly (though for fully foreign owned firms they still are higher than domestic enterprises). Also in contrast to domestic firms, net employment growth rates were sizably positive from 1996-1998 for fully foreign owned enterprises, but then turned sharply negative in 1999. Importantly, joint ventures have exhibited the most stable job reallocation rates in the economy, and by end-1999 their rates of job creation only barely were exceeded by their rates of job destruction.

**Table 8. Job Creation, Job Destruction and Net Employment Growth by Ownership Form**


| Ownership Form               | Job Creation |       | Job Destruction |       | Net Employment Growth |        |        |
|------------------------------|--------------|-------|-----------------|-------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
|                              | 97/96        | 99/98 | 97/96           | 99/98 | 97/96                 | 98/97  | 99/98  |
| Majority Public Enterprises  | 17.3%        | 21.7% | 37.3%           | 26.7% | -19.9%                | -15.4% | -5.0%  |
| Majority Private Enterprises | 7.5%         | 10.8% | 18.3%           | 13.2% | -10.9%                | -8.6%  | -2.4%  |
| Fully Foreign Enterprises    | 122.6%       | 33.4% | 105.8%          | 44.4% | 50.8%                 | 58.5%  | -11.0% |
| Joint Ventures               | 17.3%        | 11.2% | 13.3%           | 11.7% | 4.0%                  | -7.3%  | -0.5%  |

Source: Authors' calculations using data from Goskomstat


**Enterprise Profitability and Employment Restructuring.** We noted above that for 1999 there is a statistically significant positive correlation between enterprise profitability (as measured by return on assets) and size (as measured by sales revenues), a finding consistent with most studies of industrial organization worldwide. If Russia's restructuring process—through labor shedding and hiring—is being carried out efficiently, the expectation is that profitability and net employment growth should also be correlated, controlling for size differences. Looking at the simple correlation it appears that there is a positive relation between these two variables (see figure 6).

A simple estimation exercise, however, provides mix results. In a regression covering all the 24 industry sectors of return on assets (for 1999) on (i) sales revenues (for 1999) and (ii) net employment growth (for 1999 vs. 1998), both the estimated coefficient on sales revenues and on net employment growth are statistically significant (and positive), though the estimated coefficient on net employment


**Figure 5. Job Creation and Destruction by Firm Ownership, 97/96..**




**... and in 99/98**



**Net Employment Growth by Firm Ownership 1997-96 vs. 1999-98**



Source: Authors' calculations using data from Goskomstat



Source: Authors' calculations using data from Goskomstat

growth is significant only at the 10% confidence level.<sup>22</sup> This seems to suggest that employment restructuring is not occurring efficiently at this juncture in Russian firms, although of course because other elements affect profitability differences across firms—such as industry-specific structural competitiveness factors, exposure to international trade, sectoral technologies, among other factors—it is difficult to make this judgment definitively based on this simple exercise.

**Sectoral Differences in Job Creation and Destruction.** The new dataset from Goskomstat allows us to analyze in the detail differences in job creation and destruction among the industrial sectors; see Figure 7. The data indicate a great degree of sectoral variance in employment flow rates, both within a given time period and between time periods. But they also show for certain sectors, some persistency over time. In 1996/97, job creation was greatest in information and computing services (52%) and least in ferrous metallurgy (3%); the sector with the highest rate of job destruction was fishing (50%) and the lowest was timber-chemical (5%). Overall in 1996/97, the highest net employment growth rate was registered in information and computing services (24%) and the lowest was registered in fishing (-39%). This is an enormous cross-sectoral range, as Figure 7 depicts clearly.


By 1998/99 information and computing services still registered the highest rate of job creation, but its rank was shared by woodworking (both at 22%); similarly, ferrous metallurgy still ranked lowest, but its rank was shared by mechanical engineering (both at 7%). Job destruction also remained lowest in timber-chemical (7%). These results all indicate a degree of persistency. (The correlation between job destruction in 1997/96 and 1999/98 is 0.68 and statistically significant, but there is no statistically significant correlation between job creation in 1997/96 and 1999/98.) Yet while job destruction in mechanical engineering for light industry (at 26%) was the highest among the sectors, job destruction rates in information and computer services (20%) and in woodworking (23%) were quite high on a cross-sectoral basis but lower than they were in these particular industries in 1996/97. The bottom panel of Figure 7 indicates that sectoral differences in net employment growth rates in 1996/97 were much smaller by 1998/99, revealing some convergence.

<sup>22</sup> The beta coefficient for sales revenues is 0.0003 and for net employment growth is 0.74. The Adjusted- $R^2$  is 0.54. We also used lagged net employment growth (1998/97) instead of the contemporaneous one, to reduce the possibility of endogeneity. In this case, the estimated coefficient for revenues is still positive and statistically significant but the coefficient for net employment growth is not statistically different from zero.


**Figure 7. Russia: Job Creation, Destruction, and Net Employment Growth by Sector in 96-97...**



**.. and in 98-99**



**Net Employment Growth by Sector 1997-96 vs. 1999-98**



Source: Authors' calculations using Goskomstat data



Figure 8 illustrates how job reallocation flows differ. In 1996/97 job reallocation rates were highest in information and computer services (79%), other light industry (62%) and fishing (61%), and lowest in ferrous metallurgy (12%) and timber chemical (13%). In 1999/98, job reallocation in woodworking was the highest (at 45%), but this was the same rate as in the earlier period. Job reallocation rates fell in information and computer services and in fishing from 1997/96, but remained the two highest (both at 42%) just below woodworking. While ferrous metallurgy continued to register the lowest job reallocation, its rate rose a bit from 1997/96.



Source: Authors' calculations using data from Goskomstat

**Regional Variation in Job Creation and Destruction.** Among Russia's regions there is heterogeneity in rates of job creation and destruction. Table 9 summarizes key variables from the Goskomstat data for the eight regions in which we carried out the case studies, plus four other regions for comparison purposes.

Among these twelve regions, in 1997/96 Saratovskaya registered the greatest positive net employment growth (4%) and Primorskii experienced the greatest negative net employment growth (-24%). Both regions, however, had essentially the same rate of job reallocation flows (about 50%); yet in Primorskii's case, job destruction rates greatly outweighed those of job creation, whereas in Saratovskaya, job creation and destruction were more balanced.

The situation in 1999/98 is substantially different on many counts. Primorskii registered the highest positive net employment growth rate (10%), engendered by strong job creation. At the same time, Saratovskaya's net employment growth rate turned sharply negative (-8%), due to high job destruction, although Samaraskaya's net employment growth was the lowest (-12%). Moscow's and Novgorodskaya's net employment growth rates also reversed in 1999/98 from 1997/96 (respectively from -12% to 1%, and from -5% to 1.4%), both due to higher job creation and lower job destruction rates. Primorskii's and Saratovskaya's job reallocation rates, however, remained the highest (43% and 37%, respectively), along with Samaraskaya (38%).

Figures 9 and 10 and illustrate the job flow patterns for the 89 Russian regions. Across all the regions, on average, job creation rates rose only marginally (from 15% to 16%) between 1997/96 and 1999/98, whereas job destruction rates fell substantially (from 24% to 16%). Net employment growth rates, on average, rose significantly and turned just positive (from -9% to 1%).

On a region-by-region basis, persistency characterizes job creation, but not job destruction: while there is a statistically significant correlation of 0.71 between job creation rates in 1997/96 and 1999/98 in a given region, the analogous correlation between job destruction rates in 1997/96 and 1999/98 of 0.25 is not statistically significant.


**Table 9. Russia: Regional Job Creation and Destruction**  
(selected regions)

| Region           | 1997/96           |                      |                       |                            | 1999/98           |                      |                       |                            |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
|                  | Job Creation Rate | Job Destruction Rate | Job Reallocation Rate | Net Employment Growth Rate | Job Creation Rate | Job Destruction Rate | Job Reallocation Rate | Net Employment Growth Rate |
| Krasnodarskii    | 8.5%              | 18.3%                | 26.8%                 | -9.8%                      | 9.0%              | 10.7%                | 19.6%                 | -1.7%                      |
| Primorskii       | 13.8%             | 37.4%                | 51.2%                 | -23.5%                     | 26.4%             | 16.9%                | 43.3%                 | 9.5%                       |
| Nizhegorodskaya  | 8.3%              | 20.8%                | 29.1%                 | -12.4%                     | 7.5%              | 17.0%                | 24.4%                 | -9.5%                      |
| Samarskaya       | 11.3%             | 18.1%                | 29.4%                 | -6.8%                      | 13.2%             | 25.2%                | 38.3%                 | -12.0%                     |
| Saint-Petersburg | 16.8%             | 22.2%                | 39.0%                 | -5.4%                      | 10.2%             | 14.7%                | 24.9%                 | -4.4%                      |
| Leningradskaya   | 9.2%              | 17.9%                | 27.1%                 | -8.7%                      | 13.9%             | 14.2%                | 28.2%                 | -0.3%                      |
| Moscow           | 10.8%             | 22.8%                | 33.6%                 | -12.0%                     | 16.2%             | 15.2%                | 31.4%                 | 1.0%                       |
| Moskovskaya      | 9.4%              | 15.9%                | 25.3%                 | -6.6%                      | 10.3%             | 10.6%                | 20.9%                 | -0.3%                      |
| Novgorodskaya    | 10.3%             | 15.4%                | 25.7%                 | -5.0%                      | 15.0%             | 13.7%                | 28.7%                 | 1.4%                       |
| Novosibirskaya   | 9.4%              | 16.7%                | 26.1%                 | -7.2%                      | 8.7%              | 12.7%                | 21.4%                 | -3.9%                      |
| Saratovskaya     | 27.1%             | 23.1%                | 50.2%                 | 4.0%                       | 14.3%             | 22.5%                | 36.8%                 | -8.2%                      |
| Sverdlovskaya    | 15.8%             | 12.8%                | 28.6%                 | 3.0%                       | 17.1%             | 13.7%                | 30.8%                 | 3.4%                       |


Source: Authors' calculations using data from Goskomstat



**Figure 10. Russia: Net Employment Growth by Region, 1996/97 vs. 1998/99**



**Compositional Differences in Worker Separation: Variation by Reason and by Sector.** Newly available data from the Ministry of Labor shed light on the trends and variations in the attributes of worker separations for the period 1994 through the end of the Third Quarter of 2000. Figure 11 and Table 10 show that since 1994 the main—and growing—form of worker separations is “voluntary” as opposed to layoffs through “redundancies.” While there is always ambiguity in any labor market about what precisely constitutes a “voluntary” separation—for example a worker can be induced by his/her employer to “voluntarily” resign or retire—the large and significantly increasing differences between the two separation categories leaves little doubt that layoffs through redundancies constitutes a small fraction of total worker separations in Russian enterprises. Across all industries, about two-thirds of all worker separations in 1996 were categorized as voluntary, while less than 10 percent of total separations were layoffs through redundancies. By the end of the Third Quarter of 2000, the portion of total separations that were voluntary increased to almost 74 percent, while the portion that were layoffs through redundancies declined by more than 50 percent to below 4 percent.



Source: Ministry of Labor data.


Figure 12 and Table 10 illustrate differences in the forms of worker separations for 1996, 1999 and the Third Quarter of 2000 for representative sectors. In every sector, except for non-ferrous metallurgy and chemicals, there is a steady increase in the portion of total separations that were voluntary, and a steady decrease in the portion that were through redundancies. The food industry registered the largest proportion of voluntary separations in both 1996 and the Third Quarter of 2000, while light industry registered the largest proportion of redundancy separations in both 1996 and the Third Quarter of 2000. Ferrous metallurgy registered the smallest proportion of both voluntary and redundancy separations in 1996, and maintained the smallest proportion of redundancy layoffs in the Third Quarter of 2000; but in the Third Quarter of 2000, non-ferrous metallurgy registered the smallest proportion of voluntary separations.

**Table 10. Separation of Workers by Reason by Sector**  
(percent of total number of separated)

|                            | 1996                  |                                 | 1999                  |                                 | End Q3 2000           |                                 |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
|                            | Voluntary Separations | Separation Through Redundancies | Voluntary Separations | Separation Through Redundancies | Voluntary Separations | Separation Through Redundancies |
| <b>All Industries</b>      | 67.0                  | 7.9                             | 70.7                  | 6.0                             | 73.8                  | 3.5                             |
| <b>Selected Industries</b> |                       |                                 |                       |                                 |                       |                                 |
| Ferrous metallurgy         | 40.9                  | 5.2                             | 51.9                  | 4.5                             | 53.7                  | 1.8                             |
| Non-ferrous metallurgy     | 46.5                  | 9.8                             | 29.4                  | 3.3                             | 48.6                  | 2.5                             |
| Chemicals                  | 53.1                  | 13.7                            | 53.5                  | 6.3                             | 59.1                  | 3.6                             |
| Mach bldg and metal wkg    | 53.6                  | 15.4                            | 60.4                  | 8.2                             | 63.2                  | 3.1                             |
| Frstry and bldg materials  | 59.7                  | 8.3                             | 61.2                  | 4.2                             | 64.4                  | 2.1                             |
| Light industry             | 59.3                  | 15.7                            | 63.3                  | 10.6                            | 71.2                  | 4.4                             |
| Food industry              | 65.2                  | 9.1                             | 70.1                  | 5.8                             | 75.4                  | 3.8                             |

Note: Figures do not sum to 100 percent because other reasons for separation not shown.

Source: Ministry of Labor data



Source: Ministry of Labor data

## **VII. Summary and Conclusions**

In this paper we have systematically documented the dynamics of job creation and destruction in Russia since 1996, using recently available data. We explored empirically how the patterns of job creation and destruction are related to various aspects of enterprise restructuring across businesses in different sectors and regions, and with different ownership forms, size, vintage, and performance characteristics.

Our analysis relies, in part, on official firm-level data collected by Goskomstat. As is always the case with such data on transition economies, because of limits on their representatives of the country's overall enterprise population, the data may bias the results. Despite these limits, these data have enabled us to carry out a more structured and complete statistical investigation of Russian job creation and destruction and enterprise restructuring than has been performed in the past. This quantitative assessment has been complemented by a series of qualitative business case studies we carried out in eight of Russia's regions during 2000.

The case study analysis suggests there is significant heterogeneity across firms and regions. In broad terms, the case study evidence suggests that job destruction has taken place, but in some sectors and regions only to a limited degree, in large part due to institutional and incentive constraints and a still-widespread "socialist" corporate culture. At the same time, the case studies indicate job creation has materialized, particularly in sectors where the import-substitution effects of the 1998 ruble devaluation have been most pronounced, but still only slowly, mostly because of limited regional mobility and the lack of skilled workers.

Thus the qualitative evidence suggests that the incentives and constraints on enterprise restructuring and the operation of the labor market in Russia are a function of the initial economic conditions at the start of the country's transition and the institutional environment. Today Russia's economy manifests a hangover from the earlier drive for regional autarky and self-sufficiency, with large firms exhibiting excessive vertical integration, protected by local government barriers to interregional trade and investment. In turn, throughout the more than eight years following the dismantling of the Soviet system, the regionally-specialized structure of the economy has had a profound impact on the response of the country's labor market to the reform process.

As in the past, labor turnover appears higher *within* regions than *across* regions. This is in large part likely due to the existence of institutional constraints, for example in arranging for housing accommodations. But the institutions and regulations directly governing the labor market greatly affect job reallocation by either creating incentives or imposing constraints on employers' and employees' decisions. Although the 1971 Soviet version of the Labor Code, which contains a myriad of detailed rules regulating many aspects of the employer-employee relationship, in practice has had less of an impact since 1991 due to discrepancies between the code's unrealistically rigid provisions and the needs of a growing market economy, it is still an impediment to a flexible labor market. In addition to the anachronistic Labor Code, the inadequacy of the social safety net and significant political pressures—especially at the local level—also constrain labor movements and prevented the much needed restructuring of firms.

For the main part of the quantitative analysis we used firm-level data from Goskomstat that cover approximately 128,000 enterprises across 24 industrial sectors in all of the country's 89 regions for the years 1996-1999. Some of our main findings are as follows.

One measure of the amount of firm restructuring is the change in the number of registered firms between 1996-99. Although the change has been small in the aggregate, with only a 1.3% increase, there

is significant variation across sectors. Sectors where the number of registered firms has decreased substantially include clothing, shoes, tanning, furs, electronics and light industry. Substantial increases in number of firm registries have occurred in the fishing, pulp and paper, and woodworking sectors.

In the aggregate, the typical firm in Russia has experienced only modest downsizing—about 12 percent—in terms of number of employees in the four year period. As with the registration measure, there is great variability across sectors in the change of number of employees. But the data on employee numbers give a richer picture: for example, in the woodworking, pulp and paper, meat and dairy, and fishing sectors, the average number of employees per firm has in fact decreased even though the number of registered firms in these sectors has increased—suggesting that these market structures have rationalized and smaller firms have been entering these businesses, a finding consistent with our case studies, including the impact of the ruble devaluation on trade sensitive sectors. In light industry, however, although there has been a decrease in the number of firms registered, the average number of employees per firm has increased, suggesting an upsizing in firm scale has been taking place. In contrast, the employee downsizing in the mechanical engineering for light industry, electronics and precision tools sectors, which was consistent with the decrease in registered firms in these businesses, suggests in such sectors enterprises have been exiting from the market. Thus, we find evidence of particular sectors where there has been new entry by smaller firms and exit by larger, mature businesses.

Except for a lull in 1998, there has been a steady increase in the rate of job creation since 1996, especially between 1999 and 1998. But at the same time, job destruction rates have been declining over the same period, again with a substantial drop in the 1998-99 period. This means that, all other things equal, the rate of layoffs in enterprises has been decreasing, especially in the post-crisis period.

There is also a degree of persistency in job creation and destruction rates across sectors and across regions. Interestingly, there appears to be persistency in job destruction on a cross-sectoral basis but persistency in job creation on a cross-regional basis: (i) on a sector-by-sector basis, the correlation between job destruction in 1997/96 and 1999/98 is 0.68 and statistically significant, but there is no statistically significant correlation between job creation in 1997/96 and 1999/98; on a region-by-region basis, while there is a statistically significant correlation of 0.71 between job creation rates in 1997/96 and 1999/98, the analogous correlation between job destruction rates in 1997/96 and 1999/98 of 0.25 is not statistically significant.

Overall rates of return on assets rose from about 3 in 1996 to about 15 percent by end-1999, reflecting the strengthening economy.

Worker separations made on a “voluntary” basis remain the main—and growing—form of layoffs, constituting three-fourths of total separations, while layoffs made through redundancies are a shrinking form of separations, constituting about 4 percent of total separations.

While the data suggest that, on average, firm size and net employment growth are not statistically related, ownership form does seem to matter: more layoffs are occurring in public than in private enterprises, although the differentials in net employment growth rates between the two ownership groups have narrowed considerably over time. Foreign-affiliated enterprises exhibit higher average job creation and destruction rates than their domestic counterparts; but in contrast to domestic firms, job creation rates by foreign businesses in Russia have dropped between 1996-99.

Although firm size is found to be statistically correlated (positively) with profitability, restructuring through changes in net employment growth does not appear to be related statistically to profitability. This suggests that there are efficiency improvements needed in the restructuring process.



## **Bibliography**

Bilsen, V. and J. Konings (1998), "Job Creation, Job Destruction, and Growth of Newly Established, Privatized, and State-owned Enterprises in Transition Economies: Survey Evidence from Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania", *Journal of Comparative Economics*, Vol.26, 1998.

Broadman, H., ed. (1998). *Case-by-Case Privatization in the Russian Federation: Lessons from International Experience*, The World Bank.

Broadman, H., ed. (1999). *Russian Enterprise Reform: Policies to Further the Transition*, The World Bank.

Broadman, H. (2000). "Reducing Structural Dominance and Entry Barriers in Russian Industry." *The Review of Industrial Organization* . Volume 16. September.

Davis, S., J. Haltiwanger and S. Schuh (1996), "Small Business and Job Creation: Dissecting the Myth and Reassessing the Facts", *Small Business Economics*, Vol.8, 1996.

Davis, S., J. Haltiwanger and S. Schuh (1996), *Job Creation and Destruction*, MIT Press.

Faggio, G. and J. Konings (1999) "Gross Job Flows and Firm Growth in the Transition Countries: Evidence Using Firm Level Data on Five Countries", *CEPR Discussion Paper*, No. 2261.

Foley, M.(1997), "Labor Market Dynamics in Russia", Economic Growth Center, Yale University, Discussion Paper No.780.

Gaddy, C. and Ickes, B.W. (1998) "Underneath the Formal Economy: Why are Russian Enterprises Not Restructuring?" *Transition: The Newsletter about Reforming Economies*. Development Research Group. World Bank. August.

GimPLESON, V. and D. Lippoldt (n.d.) "Labour Turnover in the Russian Economy."

Haltiwanger J., and M. Vodopivec (1999), "Gross Worker and Job Flows in a Transition Economy: An analysis of Estonia", Mimeo, World Bank

Hanson and Bradshaw (forthcoming 2001), "The Territories and the Federation: An Economic Perspective", in *The Territories of the Russian Federation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Europa Publications: London.

Heleniak, Timothy (1997), "Internal migration in Russia During the Economic Transition, Post Soviet Geography and Economics, 38, No. 2.

IMC Consulting Ltd. (1999). "Mono-Company Towns: Final Report."

IMF (2000), "Russia: Selected Issues".

Jackman, R. (1998), "Unemployment and Restructuring in Central and Eastern Europe" in Boone, P., S. Gomulka, and R. Layard, eds. "Emerging From Communism: Lessons from Russia China and Eastern Europe, Cambridge: Mass: MIT Press.

- Kapeliushnikov, R., 1999, On Composition of Russian Unemployment, Russian Economic Barometer, 2. Moscow.
- Kapeliushnikov, R., 2000, Russia's Labor Market: Adjustment Without Restructuring, Draft.
- Konings and Walsh (1999), "Employment Dynamics of Newly Established and Traditional Firms: A Comparison of Russia and Ukraine", *LICOS Discussion Paper*, No. 81/1999.
- Konings, J., H. Lehmann and M. Schaffer (1996), Job Creation and Job Destruction in a Transition Economy: Ownership, Firm Size and Gross Job Flows in Polish Manufacturing, 1988-91", Centre for Economic Performance, Discussion Paper, No.282.
- Lane, Broadman and Singh (1997), "Labor Flexibility, Ownership and Firm Performance in China", *The Review of Industrial Organization*, Vol. 13, December.
- Layard, A. and A. Richter (1994), "Labor Market Adjustment in Russia", Russian Economic Trends, Vol. 3, No. 2.
- Nellis, J, "Privatization in Transition Economies: An Update" in Broadman, H., ed. (1998). *Case-by-Case Privatization in the Russian Federation: Lessons from International Experience*, The World Bank.
- OECD (1999). *Employment Outlook*. Paris.
- OECD (1997), *Labor Market Dynamics in the Russian Federation*, OECD Proceedings, Centre for Co-operation with the Economies in Transition, Paris, 1997.
- Orttung, R. ed. (2000), The Republics and Regions of the Russian Federation, East West Institute.
- Schuh, S. and R. Triest (2000), "The Role of Firms in Job Creation and Destruction in U.S. Manufacturing", *New England Economic Review*, March/April 2000.

## **Appendix 1 Firm-Level Data Sources and Measurement Issues**

In this study we use only firm-level data. They were derived from approximately 70 case studies carried out in the field in eight Russian regions as well as data from the Russian State Statistical Committee (Goskomstat). The case study data are described in the text. Here we described the Goskomstat data set.

Our primary source of data on gross employment is Goskomstat through its Accounting Balance Survey of registered enterprises. These data are collected through mandatory yearly reporting by large and medium sized enterprises, which cover some 75 percent of total employment.<sup>23</sup> The data set covers all types of ownership including fully state-owned enterprises, as well as newly privatized and de-novo private firms.

The data used in this study are derived from this larger data set and include information on 128,244 registered enterprises between 1996 and 1999. Our data set, though it covers all 89 Russian regions, focuses only on a subset of sectors of the economy, in the manufacturing and service sectors. The data set includes information at the firm-level on employment, product, location, size, average wage bill, ownership and other characteristics.

This rich data set has however a few limitations. First, since small enterprises are excluded, the most dynamic part of the economy is under-represented. This creates a bias in our measure of job flows. Secondly, the data do not provide information on the firm's vintage nor do they distinguish between continuing enterprises, start-ups and shut-offs. Thirdly, this is enterprise-level rather than plant-level data. Thus, job movements between (and within) plants of the same enterprise are not captured in our calculations. This is a serious limit especially when addressing the issue of changes in the enterprise's productivity. Fourthly, this data is collected only on a yearly basis. The point-in-time nature of this data does not allow us therefore to capture employment changes that are reversed within the same sampling period.

---

<sup>23</sup> Small enterprises in Russia are subject to a different and simpler system of reporting.

## **Appendix 2 Basic Definitions**

For the purpose of the analysis presented in this paper, we used the following definitions:

(Gross) Job creation at time  $t$ : the employment gains summed over all the firms that expand or start up between  $t-1$  and  $t$ .

(Gross) Job destruction at time  $t$ : the employment losses summed over all firms that contract or shut down between  $t-1$  and  $t$ .

Net employment change at time  $t$ : the difference between employment at time  $t$  and employment at time  $t-1$ .

(Gross) Job reallocation at time  $t$ : the sum of all firm-level employment gains and losses that occur between  $t-1$  and  $t$ .

(Gross) Worker reallocation at time  $t$ : the number of persons who change place of employment or employment status between  $t-1$  and  $t$ .

Excess job reallocation at time  $t$ : the difference between gross job reallocation and the absolute value of the net employment change.

Job creation and destruction can be expressed as rates by dividing by a measure of sector size. Following Davis, Haltiwanger and Shuh (1997), we choose to use as a measure of sector size the average employment between period  $t$  and  $t-1$  (i.e.  $[E(t) + E(t-1)]/2$ ) rather than lagged employment ( $E(t-1)$ ). This allows us to calculate rate measures that range from  $-2.0$  to  $+2.0$ , rather than from  $-1.0$  to  $+\infty$ , portraying expansion and contraction symmetrically. Thus, for example, firm startups and shutdowns have growth rates of  $+2.0$  and  $-2.0$  rather than  $+\infty$  and  $-1.0$ .

# Policy Research Working Paper Series

| Title  | Author   | Date      | Contact<br>for paper  |
|--|--|-----------|-----------------------|
| WPS2615 Trade, Growth, and Poverty   | David Dollar<br>Aart Kraay   | June 2001 | E. Khine<br>37471     |
| WPS2616 Reforming Land and Real Estate<br>Markets  | Ahmed Galal<br>Omar Razzaz   | June 2001 | D. Dietrich<br>34995  |
| WPS2617 Shanghai Rising in a Globalizing<br>World  | Shahid Yusuf<br>Weiping Wu   | June 2001 | S. Yusuf<br>82339     |
| WPS2618 Globalization and the Challenge<br>for Developing Countries  | Shahid Yusuf   | June 2001 | S. Yusuf<br>82339     |
| WPS2619 Do Banks Provision for Bad Loans<br>in Good Times? Empirical Evidence<br>and Policy Implications                                   | Michele Cavallo<br>Giovanni Majnoni                                    | June 2001 | E. Mekhova<br>85986   |
| WPS2620 Who Owns the Media?  | Simeon Djankov<br>Caralee McLiesh<br>Tatiana Nenova<br>Andrei Shleifer | June 2001 | R. Sugui<br>37951     |
| WPS2621 Does Indonesia Have a "Low-Pay"<br>Civil Service?  | Deon Filmer<br>David L. Lindauer                                       | June 2001 | H. Sladovich<br>37698 |
| WPS2622 Community Programs and Women's<br>Participation: The Chinese Experience  | David Coady<br>Xinyi Dai<br>Limin Wang                                 | June 2001 | L. Wang<br>37596      |
| WPS 2623 Trade Liberalization in China's<br>Accession to the World Trade<br>Organization   | Elena Ianchovichina<br>Will Martin                                     | June 2001 | L. Tabada<br>36896    |
| WPS2624 Are Incentives Everything? Payment<br>Mechanisms for Health Care Providers<br>in Developing Countries                              | Varun Gauri  | June 2001 | H. Sladovich<br>37698 |
| WPS2625 Australia's Experience with Local<br>Content Programs in the Auto Industry:<br>Lessons for India and Other Developing<br>Countries | Garry Pursell  | June 2001 | L. Tabada<br>36896    |
| WPS2626 Mandatory Severance Pay: Its<br>Coverage and Effects in Peru   | Donna MacIsaac<br>Martín Rama  | June 2001 | H. Sladovich<br>37698 |
| WPS2627 With the Help of One's Neighbors:<br>Externalities in the Production<br>of Nutrition in Peru                                       | Harold Alderman<br>Jesko Hentschel<br>Ricardo Sabates                  | June 2001 | P. Sader<br>33902     |

# Policy Research Working Paper Series

|         | <b>Title</b>  | <b>Author</b>   | <b>Date</b> | <b>Contact<br/>for paper</b> |
|---------|---|---|-------------|------------------------------|
| WPS2628 | Monopoly Power and Distribution in Fragmented Markets: The Case of Groundwater  | Hanan G. Jacoby<br>Rinku Murgai<br>Saeed Ur Rehman          | June 2001   | P. Kokila<br>33716           |
| WPS2629 | Bridging the Digital Divide: How Enterprise Ownership and Foreign Competition Affect Internet Access in Eastern Europe and Central Asia | George R. G. Clarke   | July 2001   | P. Sintim-Aboagye<br>37644   |
| WPS2630 | Parallel Imports of Pharmaceutical Products in the European Union   | Mattias Ganslandt   | July 2001   | L. Tabada<br>36896           |
| WPS2631 | Pension Reform in Hungary: A Preliminary Assessment   | Roberta Rocha<br>Dimitri Vittas                             | July 2001   | L. Gross<br>37030            |
| WPS2632 | Human Capital and Growth: The Recovered Role of Education Systems   | Sébastien Dessus  | July 2001   | K. Mazo<br>39744             |
| WPS2633 | Bank Privatization in Argentina: A Model of Political Constraints and Differential Outcomes   | George R. G. Clarke<br>Robert Cull                          | July 2001   | P. Sintim-Aboagye<br>37644   |
| WPS2634 | Chile's Regional Arrangements and the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas: The Importance of Market Access                             | Glenn W. Harrison<br>Thomas F. Rutherford<br>David G. Tarr  | July 2001   | L. Tabada<br>36896           |
| WPS2635 | Optimal Use of Carbon Sequestration in a Global Climate Change Strategy: Is There a Wooden Bridge to a Clean Energy Future?             | Franck Lecocq<br>Kenneth Chomitz                            | July 2001   | V. Soukhanov<br>35721        |
| WPS2636 | Processes, Information, and Accounting Gaps in the Regulation of Argentina's Private Railways   | Javier Campos-Méndez<br>Antonio Estache<br>Lourdes Trujillo | July 2001   | G. Chenet-Smith<br>36370     |
| WPS2637 | Technical Efficiency Gains from Port Reform: The Potential for Yardstick Competition in Mexico  | Antonio Estache<br>Marianela González<br>Lourdes Trujillo   | July 2001   | G. Chenet-Smith<br>36370     |
| WPS2638 | On Financing Global and International Public Goods  | Todd Sandler  | July 2001   | S. Kpundeh                   |
| WPS2639 | Public Policy toward Nongovernmental Organizations in Developing Countries  | William Jack  | July 2001   | H. Sladovich<br>37698        |
| WPS2640 | Where Has All the Foreign Investment Gone in Russia?  | Harry G. Broadman<br>Francesca Recanatini                   | July 2001   | S. Craig<br>33160            |